

Draft East Sussex Freight Strategy Consultation Questions

Respondent Information

Questions 1-3 are about the person/group/organisation responding to the survey.

Roles and Responsibilities

Q4 - Do you agree with the roles and responsibilities related to freight as set out in section 3 of the draft strategy? (Select response and an optional open response box (3,000 characters).)

Select response options for question 4 are:

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know
- ☐ Prefer not to answer
- We agree with the statement that it is important to work with adjacent local authorities on a shared approach to strategic freight, and that there will be increased opportunities to do so through the formation of the MCCA.

Freight Priority Investment Areas

Q5 - Have we included reference to relevant policy documents, evidence or opportunities for Priority Investment Area 1 (strategic freight movements)? (Select response and an optional open response box (3,000 characters).)

Select response options for questions in this section are:

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Don't know
- ☐ Prefer not to answer
- In relation to FS01 – Enhanced freight connectivity to Gatwick, the West Sussex Access to Gatwick Strategy (West Sussex Transport Plan, 2022) should be reviewed.

Q6 - Do you agree with the freight related schemes and initiatives included in Priority Investment Area 1 (strategic freight movements)? (Select response and an optional open response box (3,000 characters).)

- ☒ Don't know
- We are named as a supporting partner in investment priority FS01. While we recognise there may be opportunities to implement freight network improvements, our Access to Gatwick Strategy (WSTP, 2022) is focussed on improving surface access to the airport for passengers and employees and balancing the needs of these users with local communities. Our current position is that improving freight connectivity to Gatwick is welcome on the

provision that it does not adversely impact efforts to increase sustainable transport mode share for passengers and employees to Gatwick.

- On FS07 – Assess rail routes and infrastructure for freight capacity. ESCC should check that this priority is in conflict with the Draft Rail Strategy. The assessment should consider that future capacity gains, including resulting from the Draft Rail Strategy, may need to be utilised for improving passenger services. The indicative cost of this investment at £10-100m seems excessively high given that Network Rail should already hold the required data.

Q7 - Have we included reference to relevant policy documents, evidence or opportunities for Priority Investment Area 2 (decarbonisation)? (Select response and an optional open response box (3,000 characters).)

☒ Yes

Q8 - Do you agree with the freight related schemes and initiatives included in Priority Investment Area 1 (decarbonisation)? (Select response and an optional open response box (3,000 characters).)

☒ Yes

- We support investment in initiatives to accelerate the delivery of ZE freight infrastructure, including through the private sector.

Q9 - Have we included reference to relevant policy documents, evidence or opportunities for Priority Investment Area 3 (last mile logistics)? (Select response and an optional open response box (3,000 characters).)

☒ Yes

Q10 - Do you agree with the freight related schemes and initiatives included in Priority Investment Area 3 (last mile logistics)? (Select response and an optional open response box (3,000 characters).)

☒ Yes

- We support the development of freight consolidation initiatives where these are market-led.

Q11 - Have we included reference to relevant policy documents, evidence or opportunities for Priority Investment Area 4 (planning and policy)? (Select response and an optional open response box (3,000 characters).)

☒ Yes

Q12 - Do you agree with the freight related schemes and initiatives included in Priority Investment Area 4 (planning and policy)? (Select response and an optional open response box (3,000 characters).)

☒ Yes

- We support the development of a strategic assessment and priority framework for addressing HGV issues raised by stakeholders (though this should be expanded to include other goods vehicles).
- While we would generally support FP02 – Freight awareness workshops, it is unclear whether this is necessary as an investment priority. TfSE are currently working on a similar project that is focussed on improving stakeholder knowledge and understanding of freight issues. Given the broader scope of applicability, they may be a more suitable delivery lead.

Equalities Impact Assessment

Q13 - Do you have any feedback on the draft Freight Strategy Equalities Impact Assessment? (Select response and an optional open response box (3,000 characters).)

Select response options for question 13 are:

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Don't know
- ☐ Prefer not to answer

Overall Support and Any Other Comments

Q14 - To what extent do you support or not support the draft East Sussex Freight Strategy? (Select response.)

Select response options for question 14 are:

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neither agree or disagree
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Do not know
- ☐ Do not wish to answer

Q15 - Do you have any further comments, not covered in the previous questions, that you wish to make? (Open response box, 3,000-character limit.)

Select response options for question 15 are:

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know
- ☐ Prefer not to answer
- ESCC should consider reviewing the rail elements of this strategy to ensure it is not in conflict with, or over-dependent on, Draft Rail Strategy.
 - On paragraph 2.2, Shoreham Port should be included in the list of major ports in neighbouring local authorities, as identified by TfSE in their Freight Logistics and Gateway Strategy.
 - On paragraph 2.6, evidence is not cited for these stated reasons as to the increase of HGVs and LGVs. The strategy would benefit from including this.